



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

other hand, very little, if at all, impede Western civilization, and needed, therefore, not to be mentioned by Professor Haeckel together with the Christian superstitions, nor was there for the same reason any necessity for the courageous philosopher of Jena to denounce the "wild theories" alluded to in the article under review.

PAUL VON RAUTENFELD.

SWATOW, CHINA.

EDITORIAL REPLY.

We take pleasure in publishing Herrn von Rautenfeld's protest against our criticism of Professor Haeckel's theses. It proves that our monistic friend of Jena has staunch supporters all over the world, even in Swatow of distant China, but having read Herrn von Rautenfeld's arguments we do not feel compelled to change our views. The Editor of *The Monist* is a personal friend of Professor Haeckel, but the cause of monism would not be well served if for the sake of politeness he would abstain from criticism and avoid controversy.

In former numbers we have discussed our differences with Professor Haeckel, and there is no need of repeating them.* Be it sufficient here to state that we deem these differences of great importance because their recognition would prevent monism from being narrowed down to a onesided partisan issue, and we feel convinced that Professor Haeckel himself would accept our view if we could have a quiet hour's talk with him.

A LETTER FROM PROFESSOR MACH.

The July number of *The Monist* contained an editorial article on "Professor Mach's Philosophy" written in reply to Dr. Hans Kleinpeter's essay "On the Monism of Professor Mach," which appeared in the April number. Dr. Kleinpeter in his enthusiasm for the master whose lead he follows had been carried away in some of his statements to such an extent as to render Professor Mach's

* "Professor Haeckel's Monism and the Ideas of God and Immortality," *The Open Court*, V, 2957 (Sept. 17, 1891); "Professor Haeckel's Confession of Faith," *The Open Court*, VII, 3529 (Jan. 1893); "Monism not Mechanicism," *The Monist*, II, 438; "Professor Haeckel's Monism," *The Monist*, II, 598; "Theology as a Science," *The Monist*, XIII, 24; "Haeckel's Theses for a Monistic Alliance," *The Monist*, XVI, 120.